DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 418 TM 017 211

AUTHOR Birgensmith, Amy; Chelemer, Carol
TITLE Analysis of State Chapter 2 Applications.
INSTITUTION Department of Education, Washington, DC. Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Feb 91
NOTE 57p.
PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Block Grants; Educational Finance; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; *Financial Support; National Surveys; School Districts; *School Funds; *State Programs; Statistical Data
IDENTIFIERS *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 2; *Program Applications

ABSTRACT

The Chapter 2 program, originally authorized as Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 and reauthorized as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1988), represents a substantial investment of Federal education funds to support general educational improvement. Funds are made available to states and local education agencies (LEAs) on the basis of applications that describe how the funds will be used. This report provides a summary of the state Chapter 2 applications regarding LEA distribution formulas and weighting criteria, state advisory committee composition, and planned uses of funds reserved for state educational agency (SEA) purposes. The report is based on a review of applications from the 50 states and the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico in November 1990. Quantitative and descriptive data were abstracted from the applications and compiled for the 1989-90 school year. This paper includes five sections/chapters covering the following topics: (1) program background; (2) LEA distribution formulas; (3) state advisory committees; (4) SEA uses of funds; and (5) Chapter 2 as a force for educational improvement. Thirteen tables present data derived from the state Chapter 2 applications. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED336418

ANALYSIS OF STATE CHAPTER 2 APPLICATIONS

FEBRUARY 1991

PREPARED BY:

AMY BIRGENSMITH
AND
CAROL CHELEMER

PLANNING AND EVALUATION SERVICE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TM017211

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	5
CHAPTER 1 - PROGRAM BACKGROUND	7
CHAPTER 2 - LEA DISTRIBUTION FORMULAS	12
CHAPTER 3 - STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEES	26
CHAPTER 4 - SEA USES OF FUNDS	33
CHAPTER 5 - FORCE FOR EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT	54

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

The Chapter 2 program, a formula grant program, makes funds available to every State education agency (SEA) and local education agency (LEA) on the basis of applications received and approved by the U.S. Department of Education. Authorized originally in the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 it combined 42 programs into a single block grant emphasizing flexibility to address educational needs with minimal administrative burden. Chapter 2 was reauthorized in the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments of 1988 with its basic features intact and previously authorized activities replaced by a set of six broad program purposes. Annual appropriations have remained fairly constant at a level close to $500 million.

Chapter 2 is the major source of federal funds made available to SEAs to support educational improvement. Chapter 2 supports SEA initiatives to improve instruction through training, to expand educational materials through clearinghouse and computer network technology, and to strengthen educational programs through consultative services, curriculum review and development, and recognition of outstanding efforts. Its flexibility enables each SEA to use Federal funds to support State determined initiatives.

This report provides a summary of the Chapter 2 applications from the 50 States plus the District of Columbia (D.C.) and Puerto Rico as of November 1990. It describes LEA distribution

formula factors and weighting criteria, State advisory committee make-up, and planned uses of funds reserved for SEA purposes.

LEA Distribution Formula Factors and Weighting Criteria

A minimum of 80% of the funds made available each year to an SEA is to be distributed to its LEAS on the basis of relative enrollment, adjusted to provide higher per pupil allocations to LEAs with the greatest numbers or percentages of children whose education entails a higher cost. High cost factors include high poverty areas, economically disadvantaged children, and children in sparsely populated areas.

- Of the 50 States, D.C. and Puerto Rico, 23 use all three factors (enrollment, poverty, sparsity) to allocate funds.
- Enrollment is the predominant factor in distribution formulas. The mean percentage of funds allocated on enrollment is 75 percent across all States.
- Each State establishes its own definitions of "high cost factors" which serve as the cut-off points when distributing funds to LEAS. For example, Pennsylvania defines sparsity as population per square mile of less than 100 persons.
- The heavy emphasis on enrollment in the distribution formulas adopted by States undermines the ability to distribute extra funds to addresss the special needs of "high cost" students.

State Advisory Committees

Each State is statutorily required to have a State Advisory Committee (SAC). SAC members are appointed by the governor and are to be "broadly representative of educational interests and the general public in the State." The SAC's primary functions

are to advise the SEAs on the allocation of funds, on the formula for the allocation of funds to LEAs, and on various additional activities associated with planning programs assisted under this Chapter.

- Of the 38 States reporting the size of their SACs, the mean number of members was 17.

Planned Uses of Reserved Funds

By statute, SEAs are permitted to reserve up to 20 percent of their Chapter 2 allocation for State use. Of this 20 percent, SEAs are permitted to use up to 25% for Chapter 2 program administration, and must use at least 20 percent for effective schools programs. The remaining funds must be used for non-administrative activities and technical assistance to LEAs in support of on the progam's six targeted assistance areas: (1) Meeting the Needs of At-Risk Students; (2) Acquiring Instructional Materials; (3) Implementing Schoolwide Improvement; (4) Providing Professional Development for Educational Personnel; (5) Enhancing Students' Personal Excellence in such areas as the Arts, Physical Education, and Health; and (6) Providing Enrichment for, but not limited to, Gifted and Talented Students, Technology Education, Early Childhood Education, and Community Education.

In Fiscal Year 1989:

- Four States reserved less than 20 percent of their Chapter 2 allocation for State use.
- Twenty-seven states reserved less than 25 percent for Chapter 2 program administration.

- Across all States, the median amount for targeted assistance was $1,005,269.

- Based on States' planned expenditures, the proportion of funding for each targeted assistance program was: At-Risk 16 percent; Instructional Material 8 percent; Schoolwide Improvement 42 percent; Professional Development 15 percent; Personal Excellence 7 percent; and Enrichment 12 percent.

- Activities on behalf of at-risk students include assisting LEAs to remediate students failing functional literacy exams, training school staff to resolve learning and behavior problems, and providing grants and technical assistance to conduct dropout prevention efforts.

- Activities to improve the quality of educational materials available to schools include supporting State film libraries and library networks, and conducting workshops for teachers in the use of new educational technology.

- Activities to encourage schoolwide reform efforts include recognizing and rewarding top performance, disseminating information about improvement processes through workshops and publications, providing funding to demonstrate or implement improvement strategies, and revising State curriculum guides to reflect current research on effective schools.

- Activities to foster professional development include supporting Teacher Centers, and conducting training on instructional and management topics.

- Activities to provide programs in categorical areas as diverse as physical fitness, the arts, suicide prevention, community service, and technology education include developing the capabilities of SEA consultants to advise school districts on effective programs, and developing curriculum and statewide initiatives relevant to these educational areas.

Force for Educational Improvement

Chapter 2 is the major source of Federal funds States use to foster educational improvement. State applications reflect a diversity of approaches. Noteworthy categories of leadership initiatives include:

- Communication with the education and lay communities.
- Support for educational innovation.
- Focus on educational outcomes and excellence.

INTRODUCTION

The Chapter 2 program (originally authorized as Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981; reauthorized in the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988 as Chapter 2 of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) represents a substantial investment of Federal education funds to support general educational improvement. Funds are made available to every State and local educational agency on the basis of applications (usually multi-year) that describe how the funds will be used.

The Department of Education receives and approves the State education agencies' applications. While each application is examined to ensure compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements, no attempt has been made previously to compile the contents of the applications to provide a national view of State plans and operations.

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the State Chapter 2 applications regarding LEA distribution formula factors and weighting criteria, State advisory committee make-up, and planned uses of funds reserved for SEA purposes.

The report is based on a review of Chapter 2 applications from the 50 States plus D.C. and Puerto Rico in November 1990. Pertinent quantitative and descriptive data were abstracted from the applications and then compiled. Financial information relates to the 1989-90 program year.

The report consists of five chapters. Chapter 1 provides a basic description of the Chapter 2 program. Chapter 2 examines the distribution formulas developed and used by States to allocate program dollars to LEAs. Chapter 3 describes the membership of State advisory committees. Chapter 4 provides quantitative and descriptive data regarding SEAs' planned uses of Chapter 2 funds. Chapter 5 identifies a number of State Chapter 2 initiatives which appear particularly interesting or promising.

We wish to thank Dr. Lee Wickline, Director of the School Effectiveness Division in the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education and his staff, particularly Robert Kastner, for their cooperation in the project, their advice regarding the scope of this report and their suggestions for refining the final report.

CHAPTER 1
PROGRAM BACKGROUND

The Chapter 2 Program, reauthorized in 1988 in the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments, was initiated in 1981 as the Education Block Grant program. It replaced 42 Federal education programs having diverse purposes and funding mechanisms with a single formula grant program to support educational improvement. The antecedent programs' purposes were all authorized in the Chapter 2 program, leaving it to the discretion of the recipient SEAs and LEAs to determine which purposes to support. In addition to increased flexibility for SEAs and LEAs, the Chapter 2 program reduced their paperwork burden by greatly reducing the number of applications, reports, and financial accounting records. It also increased the participation of nonpublic school students since a number of the antecedent programs lacked provisions for nonpublic school participation.

Program Purposes and Uses of Funds

During reauthorization, Chapter 2 acquired a revised set of program purposes:

" (1) to provide the initial funding to enable State and local educational agencies to implement promising education programs that can be supported by State and local sources of funding after such programs are demonstrated to be effective; (2) to provide a continuing source of innovation, educational improvement, and

support for library and instructional materials; (3) to meet the special education needs of at risk and high costs students (e.g., those in danger of failing or dropping out and those whose education entails a higher than average cost); (4) to enhance the quality of teaching and learning through initiating and expanding effective schools programs; and (5) to allow State and local educational agencies to meet their educational needs and priorities for targeted assistance (later defined)" (Section 1501b).

The uses of funds section was also changed. Rather than referencing the antecedent programs, the statute includes a list of six categories for the use of funds. These six categories include:

"(1) programs to meet the educational needs of students at risk of failure in school and of dropping out and students for whom providing an education entails higher than average cost; (2) programs for the acquisition and use of instructional and educational materials, including library books, reference materials, computer software and hardware for instructional use, and other curricular materials that would be used to improve the quality of instruction; (3) innovative programs designed to carry out schoolwide improvements, including the effective schools program; (4) programs of training and professional development to enhance the knowledge and skills of educational personnel including teachers, librarians, school counselors and other pupil services personnel, and administrators and school board members;

(5) programs designed to enhance personal excellence of students and student achievement, including instruction in ethics, performing and creative arts, humanities, activities in physical fitness and comprehensive health education, and participation in community service projects; and (6) other innovative projects which would enhance the educational program and climate of the school, including programs for gifted and talented students, technology education programs, early childhood education programs, community education and programs for youth suicide prevention." (Section 1531b)

Program Appropriations

Appropriations for the Chapter 2 program have ranged between $450 and $500 million annually since the program's inception. Table 1-1 displays the funding history since the passage of the Hawkins-Stafford Amendments.

TABLE 1-1
Chapter 2 Appropriations

Fiscal Year	Amount
1989	$462,977,000
1990	455,717,000
1991	449,890,000

Distribution of Funds to States

Chapter 2 is a State formula grant program. Allocations are made to States each year based on a statutory distribution formula. The statute directs the Secretary to reserve up to 7 percent of the Chapter 2 appropriation to make grants to the

Insular Areas and to carry out the National Programs (Part B of Chapter 2). The remaining funds are allotted to each State according to its proportion of the national school-age population (i.e., population aged 5 through 17) but assuring each State a minimum of one-half of one percent of the amount allotted to States. Table 1-2 displays grant amounts for Fiscal Year 1989.

Table 1-2
Distribution of Funds to States

STATE	GRANTS TO STATES	STATE	GRANTS TO STATES
ALABAMA	$ 7,968,929	NEBRASKA	$ 2,927,758
ALASKA	$ 2,295,857	NEVADA	$ 2,295,857
ARIZONA	$ 6,126,963	NEW HAMPSHIRE	$ 2,295,857
ARKANSAS	$ 4,604,917	NEW JERSEY	$12,777,432
CALIFORNIA	$48,472,806	NEW MEXICO	$ 3,024,703
COLORADO	$ 5,865,210	NEW YORK	$30,179,170
CONNECTICUT	$ 5,264,147	NORTH CAROLINA	$11,526,834
DELAWARE	$ 2,295,857	NORTH DAKOTA	$ 2,295,857
FLORIDA	$18,342,110	OHIO	$19,999,880
GEORGIA	$12,205,453	OKLAHOMA	$ 6,156,046
HAWAII	$ 2,295,857	OREGON	$ 4,808,502
IDAHO	$ 2,295,857	PENNSYLVANIA	$20,048,353
ILLINOIS	$21,075,976	RHODE ISLAND	$ 2,295,857
INDIANA	$10,470,126	SOUTH CAROLINA	$ 6,640,775
IOWA	$ 5,196,285	SOUTH DAKOTA	$ 2,295,857
KANSAS	$ 4,440,109	TENNESSEE	$ 8,948,080
KENTUCKY	$ 7,154,586	TEXAS	$33,756,463
LOUISIANA	$ 9,015,942	UTAH	$ 4,314,080
MAINE	$ 2,295,857	VERMONT	$ 2,295,857
MARYLAND	$ 7,678,093	VIRGINIA	$10,062,955

MASSACHUSETTS	$ 9,180,750	WASHINGTON	$ 8,017,402
MICHIGAN	$17,401,738	WEST VIRGINIA	$ 3,616,071
MINNESOTA	$ 7,639,314	WISCONSIN	$ 8,851,135
MISSISSIPPI	$ 5,622,846	WYOMING	$ 2,295,857
MISSOURI	$ 9,112,888	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	$ 2,295,857
MONTANA	$ 2,295,857	PUERTO RICO	$ 8,534,578

TOTAL GRANTS - $462,977,000

Chapter Two
LEA Distribution Formulas

A minimum of 80% of the funds made available each year to the SEA is to be distributed to LEAs within each state. These funds must be distributed on the basis of relative enrollment, including both public and private nonprofit schools, within the school districts of each agency. Special adjustments are made to provide higher per pupil allocation to those LEAs with "the greatest numbers or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher than average cost per child." Such "high cost" factors include -

"(1) children living in areas with high concentrations of low income families,

"(2) children from low income families, and

"(3) children living in sparsely populated areas.

Of the 50 states, District of Columbia and Puerto Rico:

- o 23 use enrollment, low income factors, and sparsity to allocate funds;
- o 25 use enrollment and low income factors;
- o 2 use enrollment and sparsity.

Distribution Formula
Table 2-1
Use of Enrollment and High Cost Factors

STATE	ENROLLMENT	LOW-INCOME	SPARSITY
AL	X	X	
AK	X	X	X
AZ	X	X	X
AR	X	X	
CA	X	X	
CO	X	X	X
CT	X	X	
DE	X	X	
DC*			
FL	X	X	
GA	X	X	
HI*			
ID	X	X	X
IL	X	X	
IN	X	X	
IA	X	X	
KS	X	X	X
KY	X	X	X
LA	X	X	
ME	X	X	
MD	X	X	
MA	X	X	
MI	X	X	X
MN	X	X	X
MS	X	X	X
MO	X	X	X
MT	X	X	X

STATE	ENROLLMENT	LOW-INCOME	SPARSITY
NB	X	X	X
NV	X	X	X
NH	X	X	X
NJ	X	X	
NM	X		X
NY	X	X	
NC	X	X	
ND	X	X	X
OH	X	X	
OK	X	X	X
OR	X	X	X
PA	X	X	X
RI	X	X	
SC	X	X	
SD	X		X
TN	X	X	
TX	X	X	
UT	X	X	X
VT	X	X	X
VA	X	X	
WA	X	X	
WV	X	X	X
WI	X	X	X
WY	X	X	X
PR*			

* The District of Columbia, Hawaii and Puerto Rico are the SEA and the LEA; therefore, there is no requirement for a distribution formula. Hawaii distributes funds on a percentage basis based on various types of grant programs - see "state cutoffs" section. The District of Columbia did not indicate on their state application how funds were distributed.

Definition of Low Income Criteria

Most states using low income as a "high cost" factor base the definition of the low income criteria on the number of students eligible for free/reduced lunch. Those states using sparsity as a "high cost factor" use the number of students per square mile as the basis for definition. Each state using this "high cost" factor definition established a minimum level of population density. (See Tables 2-2 and 2-3)

Distribution Formula
Table 2-2
Definition of Low Income by State

Definition of Low Income	States
Number of students eligible for free/reduced lunch	AL, AZ, AR, FL, ID, IN, IA, LA, MD, MI, MS, NB, OK, TX
Number of students receiving free/ reduced lunch	GA, NC, KY, UT, WA, WY
Number of students eligible for Chapter 1	AZ, CO, IL, KS, MD, NV, ND, VT
Number of Chapter 1 students enrolled	MN, NH, WV
AFDC eligibility	CT, MA, MT, PA, RI
AFDC participant	CA, DE, MO, NV, MN, WI
Community wealth factors	CT
Number of low income students	AK, ME, NY, OH, OK, RI, SC, VT, PR
Low property valuation	MN
Annual income less than minimum amount established	NJ
Distribution below poverty line	TN

Distribution Formula
Table 2-3
Definition of Sparsity by State

Definition of Sparsity	State
Sparsity based on enrollment	AZ, AK, CO, ID, MO, MT, NM, OR, SD, UT, WI
Sparsity based on density per square mile	CO, ID, IN, KS, KY, MI, MN, NB, NH, ND, OK, PA, SD, VT, WV, WI
Sparsity based on distance transported	MS, OR, WY
Sparsity based on Basic Pupil Support Ratio	NV
District below taxable wealth of student	SD

The majority of funds allocated are distributed on the basis of enrollment. The average percentage of the 49 States using enrollment to allocate funds is 75% with a range of 95% (AL, FL, MS, SD) to 16% (NY).

Among States using low income as a high cost factor, the average percentage distributed on the basis of low income is 23%. The range for these 47 States is 84% (NY) to 2.5% (MS). The average percentage for States using sparsity as a criterion for "high cost" funds is 9%. The range for these 25 states is 2% (IN) to 40% (AR).

Distribution Formula
Table 2-4
Percentage Breakdown of Each High Cost Factor

STATE	ENROLLMENT	LOW-INCOME	SPARSITY
AL	95.0%	5.0%	
AK	35.0	25.0	40.0%
AZ	weight	system	used*
AR	90.0	10.0	
CA	72.0	28.0	
CO	83.0	16.0	17.0
CT	54.0	46.0	
DE	90.0	10.0	
FL	95.0	5.0	
GA	50.0	50.0	
ID	87.0	9.0	4.0
IL	70.0	30.0	
IN	83.0	15.0	2.0
IA	80.0	20.0	
KS	76.0	14.0	10.0
KY	91.3	5.5	3.2
LA	85.0	15.0	
ME	80.0	20.0	
MD	90.0	10.0	
MA	40.0	60.0	
MI	weight	system	used*
MN	80.0	15.5	4.5
MS	95.0	2.5	2.5
MO	80.0	10.0	10.0
MT	weight	system	used*
NB	80.0	15.0	5.0
NV	90.0	5.0	5.0

STATE	ENROLLMENT	LOW-INCOME	SPARSITY
NH	80.0%	17.0%	3.1%
NJ	70.0	30.0	
NM	70.0		30.0
NY	16.0	84.0	
NC	75.0	25.0	
ND	87.0	9.0	4.0
OH	weight	system	used*
OK	85.0	10.0	15.0
OR	70.0	15.0	15.0
PA	60.0	35.0	5.0
RI	50.0	50.0	
SC	70.0	30.0	
SD	95.0		5.0
TN	90.0	10.0	
TX	weight	system	used*
UT	weight	system	used*
VT	75.0	25.0	
VA	65.0	35.0	
WA	67.0	33.0	
WV	90.0	5.0	5.0
WI	50.0	47.0	3.0

* Weight systems will be further explained in the following "state cut-offs" section. Each weight system used is different and should be reviewed under each particular state.

** Wyoming is omitted because the percentage information was not available.

In addition, each state establishes its own definition of "high cost" factors which serve as the cut-off points when making fund distributions. The following are the state definitions of such high cost factors.

STATE CUT-OFFS - HIGH COST FACTORS

ALABAMA - **low income** - enrollment for LEA and private school must consist of 60% or more low-income children.

ALASKA - **low income** - any district with 7 or more low income students.
- **sparsity** - all LEA's having a district enrollment of less than 2,999 students and has more than one incorporated community or LEA with less than 999 total district enrollment in any one community. Any district that does not generate $5,000 from the combined enrollment, low income and sparsity factors shall receive $5,000 total.

ARIZONA - **low income** - children living in areas with high concentrations of low-income families awarded an additional .05 with factor based on at least 49% of LEA student population qualifying for free/reduced-price lunch program.
- children from low-income families will be awarded an additional .05 weight factor based on student Chapter 1 eligibility.
- **sparsity** - awarded an additional .10 weight factor based on enrollment for LEAs with less than 500 students. Two percent of the portion of the state grant available to LEAs will be allotted on an adjusted basis.

ARKANSAS - **low income** - LEAs with 50% or more of enrollment eligible for free or reduced lunch.

CALIFORNIA - **enrollment** - weight of 1 for each student enrolled in the public school or private nonprofit schools.
- **low income** - (AFDC) - weight of 1, 2 or 3 1/2 points given. If concentration is upper 1/4 of the distribution of districts, 3 1/2 points allocated; second highest quarter, 2 points allocated; third quarter, 1 point allocated; lowest quarter, zero points allocated.
- minimum funding level or "floor" set at $3,417.

COLORADO - **low income** - Chapter 1 definition used. Adjusted figure will be used to compute the number of low income students in excess of 15% of the district fall student enrollment.
- **sparsity** - must be defined as rural or of small attendance; density of one student/square mile; total kindergarten through twelfth grade enrollment of 500 or less.

CONNECTICUT - **weighting factor formula:**

- o school district weighted enrollment = [(community wealth factor/district wealth + AFDC concentration factor) x public and nonpublic enrollment] + AFDC count (receiving).
- o school district share = weighted enrollment (LEA) / state. Chapter 2 grant = school district share x total allocation.

DELAWARE - **low income** - (AFDC) - reserved for LEAs whose percentage of such children exceed statewide average percentage (approximately 1/2 of LEAs).

FLORIDA - **low income** - 15% of the students must qualify for free/reduced lunch.

GEORGIA - **low income** - 5% or more of the total enrollment qualifies as high-cost.

HAWAII - Public LEA categories:
(1) 20% of the funds based on developmental grant programs ($459,172)
(2) 4% funds based on discretionary grant programs ($91,834)
(3) 56% funds based on formula grant programs

IDAHO - **low income** - children receiving free and reduced lunch exceeds 20% of the total enrollment.
- **sparsity** - number of enrolled children per square mile is less than 20 children per square mile and in which the number of children enrolled is below 600 children.

ILLINOIS - **low income** - districts with 10% or more economic disadvantaged children receive high cost monies.

INDIANA - **low income** - 15% of student in district on free lunch.
- **sparsity** - less than 12 students/square mile.

IOWA - **low income** - 15% of students eligible to receive free lunches.

KANSAS - **low income** - children from low income families as determined by Chapter 1 data for those districts having an above-average number or % of low income students enrolled.
- **sparsity** - 2 students per square mile or less.

KENTUCKY - **low income** - each LEA having more than 33% of the total enrollment on free and reduced lunch receives an additional $3.00 per child.
- **sparsity** - LEAs with fewer than 6.9 children per square mile receives an additional $2.00 per child.

LOUISIANA - **low income** - 15% of the students must participate in the free-lunch program.

MAINE - **low income** - district must have at least 20% of the student population defined as low income.

MARYLAND - **low income** - 25% of the basic enrollment must be eligible for Chapter 1 services and free/reduced lunch.

MASSACHUSETTS - **low income** - districts must have a 5% minimum of children from low income families and be receiving aid through AFDC.

MICHIGAN - **sparsity** - districts in which there are 6.5 or fewer students per square mile.
- **low income** - districts in which 1,500 or more students or 20% or more of the student membership are eligible under federal poverty criteria.
- **low income** - percentage of students that qualify is greater than or equal to the state average of 21.9%

MINNESOTA - **low income** - 8% - top 3 quartiles of Chapter 1 students enrolled.
- 4.5% - lowest quartile of property valuation.
- 4.5% - sparsity - less than 5 students per square mile.
- 3% - students receiving AFDC must be 6% of enrollment.

MISSISSIPPI - **poverty** - rank order LEAs.
- **sparsity** = ADA transported students / square miles in distance transported --- rank order LEAs.
- Ranked on weighted case (1-10) for each factor. Weights are then added and divided by two. Any LEA with a total weight of 7 or above receive hi-cost funds.

MISSOURI - **low income** - (AFDC) - 10% or more of the enrollment.
- **sparsity** - less than 350 students enrolled and the student population density is less than the state average.
- The formula will provide a weight of 1.0 for each child enrolled in the LEA and a possible additional .5 or 1.0 for high cost factors.

MONTANA - **enrollment** - average number of regularly enrolled, full-time pupils, both public and non-public schools. (weight of 1.0)
- **low income** - 10 or more low-income students who qualify for AFDC. (weight of 2.0)
- **sparsity** - total enrollment, including private school students, of less than 100. (weight of .5)

NEBRASKA - **low income** - LEAs in the upper quartile.
- **sparsity** - less than 3 students per square mile within the district.

NEVADA - **low income** - Districts with 2,000 or more students from low income families are eligible.
- **sparsity** - districts whose Basic Pupil Support Ratio is 10% or more above the average cost.

NEW HAMPSHIRE - **sparsity** - density less than 10 students per square mile.
- **low income** - percentage of Chapter 1 students is greater than 5% of the number of children enrolled in the public schools of the LEA.

NEW JERSEY - **low income** - 16% or more of the students enrolled must be from families with an annual income of less than $12,597.

NEW MEXICO - **sparsity** - LEA with less than 4,000 in student membership and/or has individual elementary and junior high schools with an enrollment less than 200 and/or; individual high schools in which the enrollment is less than 400 and/or; the school district has in excess of 10,000 students in membership with a ratio of membership to senior high schools of less than 4,000 to one.

NEW YORK - **low income** - formula reflects the allocation of money for percentage of poverty in the school district and relative concentration of poverty in the school district.

NORTH CAROLINA - **low income** - a minimum of 15% of the students must be participating in the free lunch program.

NORTH DAKOTA - **sparsity** - any LEA having one child or less/square mile.
- **low income** - required minimum of 20 low income units.

OHIO - **low income** - 25% or more of the combined average daily membership is low income students.
- **low income** - total number of low income children is equal to or above the state average of low income children in all school districts.

OKLAHOMA - **low income** - 20% of the students or any LEA with more than 100 students eligible for free/reduced lunch.
- **sparsity** - lowest 80% of the LEAs in density.

OREGON - **low income** - districts having 12.5% of students from low-income families.

- **sparsity** - 25 low income students or less will be credited with $25 per student for the first four students and $5 per each additional student.

- **geographic isolation** - administration below 100 in grades 1 through 8 where the nearest elementary school is 10 miles or more by the nearest traveled road, or a school with an administration below 100 in grades 9-12 where the next high schools is 15 miles or more by the nearest traveled road and which has been approved by the Oregon Board of Education as qualifying for "small school correction" status.

PENNSYLVANIA - **low income** - students in districts with 3% or 100 or more low income students (resident children 5 to 17 years old from families which receive $2,000 or more per year from AFDC).

- **sparsity** - population per square mile of less than 100.

PUERTO RICO - **low income** - schools located in areas having a 92% or more low income level.

RHODE ISLAND - **low income** - districts are rank-ordered on the basis of the # of children who are low income - 15 out of 37 selected.

SOUTH CAROLINA - **low income** - necessary to have either more high cost students than the state average of 1,601 or a higher percentage than the state average percentage of high cost children which was 22.36.

SOUTH DAKOTA - **sparsity** - 400 or less students in K-12 district; 1 or less student per mile per LEA; 20 miles to nearest high school; or district below taxable wealth per pupil.

TENNESSEE - **low income** - below poverty line based on census data.

TEXAS - **low income** - students eligible for free and reduced lunch.

UTAH - **low income** - any student having less than 100 children considered low income based on free lunch data.

- **sparsity** - elementary--165; junior high--389; senior high--417; six year high school--722.

VERMONT - **low income** - indicator of the number of children from low income families based on the number of school-aged children residing with families receiving food stamps.

- **sparsity** - number of students enrolled divided by the square miles in the district.

VIRGINIA - **low income** - LEA with 12% of Chapter 1 children or more.

WASHINGTON - **low income** - 296 LEAs are ranked in descending order by the percentage of children served free and reduced lunches the previous year. The school population of these agencies are then summed. Those districts serving the greatest percentages of free and reduced lunches to half the student population are considered those districts with the greatest concentrations of children from low income families and so entitled to the high cost factor.

WEST VIRGINIA - **low income** - counties serving a Chapter 1 population greater than 7.08% of the total school enrollment.
- **sparsity** - counties having a student population density less than 13.85 students per square mile.

WISCONSIN - **low income** - (AFDC) - LEA must have at least 2% of its enrollment identified as AFDC children.
- **Sparsity** - top quartile of LEAs are eligible.

WYOMING - **low income** - 20% of students must be eligible for free/reduced lunch.
- **sparsity** - based on the number of students attending schools located 15 or miles from a major attendance center (100 or more students).

In sum, the majority of funds are distributed on the basis of enrollment. To the extent that a State distributes a large perentage of funds on the basis of enrollment, the State minimizes its ability to adjust allocations to reflect the relative needs of LEAs. There is a parallel issue at the LEA level. LEAs decide whether to reserve the Chapter 2 funds allocated on "high cost" factors for services for "high cost" students. State Chapter 2 applications provide no information on this optional targetting provision.

CHAPTER THREE
State Advisory Committees

Section 1522 of P. L. 100-297 "provides for á process of active and continuing consultation with the State educational agency of an advisory committee, appointed by the Governor and determined by the Governor to be broadly representative of the educational interests and the general public in the State." Representatives on the committee must include:

> "(A) public and private elementary and secondary schoolchildren;
>
> "(B) classroom teachers;
>
> "(C) parents of elementary and secondary schoolchildren;
>
> "(D) local boards of education;
>
> "(E) local and regional school administrators;
>
> "(F) institutions of higher education;
>
> "(G) the State legislature;
>
> "(H) elementary and secondary school librarians;
>
> "(I) school counselor and other pupil services personnel.

The advisory committee's primary functions are to advise the State education agency on the allocation of State reserved funds among targeted programs, on the formula for the allocation of funds to local education agencies, and on the "planning, development, support, implementation, and evaluation of State programs assisted under this Chapter." The activities of each SAC will not be discussed in detail because the majority of the state applications directly repeated the statutory language. Little or no additional detail was provided regarding their activities and services.

Thirty-eight States reported the number of representatives participating in their State Advisory Committee. The mean for these 38 States was 17 with a range of 7 members (GA) to 29 members (NY). Table 3-1 provides the number of members by State. Table 3-2 provides the number of members by State across the required membership categories. Fifteen States did not include this information in their applications but did provide the required assurance that the committee was properly constituted. Seven States explicitly identified committee vacancies. Sixteen States' committees appear to lack representation in one or more categories but this is probably due to difficulty in identifying the proper category based on the application.

STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEES
TABLE 3-1

State	Total Committee Members	State	Total Committee Members
ALABAMA	16	MONTANA	7
ALASKA	13	NEBRASKA	11
ARIZONA	20	NEVADA	9
ARKANSAS	Not Reported	NEW HAMPSHIRE	14
CALIFORNIA	18	NEW JERSEY	Not Reported
COLORADO	18	NEW MEXICO	15
CONNECTICUT	25	NEW YORK	29
DELAWARE	Not Reported	NORTH CAROLINA	Not Reported
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	Not Reported	NORTH DAKOTA	Not Reported
FLORIDA	20	OHIO	13
GEORGIA	7	OKLAHOMA	28

State	Total Committee Members	State	Total Committee Members
ALABAMA	16	MONTANA	7
HAWAII	18	OREGON	Not Reported
IDAHO	15	PENNSYLVANIA	Not Reported
ILLINOIS	Not Reported	RHODE ISLAND	14
INDIANA	23	SOUTH CAROLINA	14
IOWA	Not Reported	SOUTH DAKOTA	18
KANSAS	17	TENNESSEE	16
KENTUCKY	27	TEXAS	10
LOUISIANA	Not Reported	UTAH	12
MAINE	18	VERMONT	18
MARYLAND	19	VIRGINIA	25
MASSACHUSETTS	17	WASHINGTON	13
MICHIGAN	23	WEST VIRGINIA	10
MINNESOTA	19	WISCONSIN	24
MISSISSIPPI	9	WYOMING	Not Reported
MISSOURI	Not Reported	PUERTO RICO	Not Reported

STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEES
TABLE 3-2 /1

STATE	PUBLIC/ PRIVATE SCHOOL	TEACHER	PARENTS	LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD	SCHOOL ADM.	INST. OF HIGHER EDUC.	STATE LEGIS-LATURE	SCHOOL LIBRARIAN	PUPIL PERSONNEL	OTHER /3
AL	2	3	1	1	4	1	2	1	1	
AK /2										
AZ	3	3	2	1	3	1	4	1	1	
AR /2										
CA	2	2	1	2	1	2	5	VACANT	VACANT	3
CO	2	2	4	1	3	4	1	1	1	
CT	2	3	1	1	5	1	2		1	9
DE /2										
DC /2										
FL	3	1	1	2	3	3	2	1	1	3
GA		2			1	1	1			2
HI	2	2	3		3	1	2	1	1	3
ID	2	2	1	2	3	1	4			
IL /2										
IN	2	5	4	2	4	2	1	1	2	
IA /2										
KS	4	3	1	1	2	2	2	VACANT	VACANT	
KY	4	4	5	1	5	2	2	2	2	
LA /2										
ME	4	1	6	1	2	1	1	VACANT	VACANT	
MD	2	3	2	2	4	2	2			2

STATE	PUBLIC/ PRIVATE SCHOOL	TEACHER	PARENTS	LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD	SCHOOL ADM.	INST. OF HIGHER EDUC.	STATE LEGIS-LATURE	SCHOOL LIBRARIAN	PUPIL PERSONNEL	OTHER /3
MA	1	2	1	4	3	1	2	1		2
MI	3	2	1		8	1	1			8
MN	1	2	2	1	3	1	2	2	1	4
MS	2	1	2	1		1	2			
MO /2										
MT	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	
NB	1	2		1	3	1	2			VACANT
NV		2	1		3	1	2	VACANT	VACANT	
NH	3	1	2	1	2	1	1	VACANT	VACANT	1
NJ /2										
NM		1	1	1	6	1	1	1	1	1
NY	1	6	3	4	3	4	2	VACANT	VACANT	2
NC /2										
ND /2										
OH	1	2	1	1	4	1	2	1	1	
OK	3	2		1	12	2	1		1	2
OR /2										
PA /2										
RI	2	2	1	1	7	1				
SC	3	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	
SD	2	3	2	3	3	2	1	1		
TN	2	5	1	1	1	1	4	4	4	
TX	1	2	1	1	1	2	1		1	

STATE	PUBLIC/ PRIVATE SCHOOL	TEACHER	PARENTS	LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD	SCHOOL ADM.	INST. OF HIGHER EDUC.	STATE LEGIS-LATURE	SCHOOL LIBRARIAN	PUPIL PERSONNEL	OTHER /3
UT	1	1	2	1	3	1	1	1	1	
VT	3	4	3	1	2	1	3	1	3	3
VA	2	1	2	5	2	2	2			5
WA		1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	3
WV		1	2	1	2		1			3
WI	3	3	2	2	4	2	4	1	1	2
WY /2										
PR /2										

/1 Individual sections when totaled may not equal the totals that appear on Table 3-1 due to some individuals being classified within one or more categories.

/2 Provided the required assurance in the State application and chose not to list committee members.

/3 See below for further breakdown and classification.

Explanation of "Other" Category
Table 3-2

CALIFORNIA - 3 Business Community Members.

CONNECTICUT - 3 State Board members; 1 Governor's Office; 1 Media;
2 Business Community; 1 State Labor; and 1 Intermediate Unit.

FLORIDA - 3 Business Community Members.

GEORGIA - 1 Attorney; 1 Retired Administrator.

HAWAII - 3 Community Members.

MARYLAND - 1 Student Representative; 1 County Associate.

MICHIGAN - 1 Representative of Public Teacher Association; 7 vacancies.

MINNESOTA - 1 Handicapped Student Representative; 1 Student Representative; 1 Gifted and Talented Educator; 1 Business Community Representative.

NEBRASKA - a few unidentified vacancies to fill.

NEW HAMPSHIRE - 1 School Board vacancy.

NEW MEXICO - 1 Student Representative.

NEW YORK - 2 other individuals non-categorized.

OKLAHOMA - 1 Student Representative; 1 Media Representative.

VERMONT - 2 Student Representatives; 1 Special Needs Children Representative.

VIRGINIA - 1 PTA Representative; 1 VML Representative; 1 VAC Representative; 1 Locally Elected Official; 1 Chairman.

WASHINGTON - 1 Student of Higher Education Representative; 1 State Board of Education; 1 Private Industry.

WEST VIRGINIA - 1 Administrative Assistant; 1 Coordinator of Institutions Representative; 1 Graduate Studies Institute Representative.

WISCONSIN - 2 at-large.

CHAPTER 4
STATE USES OF FUNDS

Funds Reserved for State Use

By statute States are permitted to reserve up to 20 percent of their Chapter 2 allocation for State use; the remainder is distributed to LEAs on a formula basis (see Chapter 3).

- In FY 1989 four States reserved less than 20 percent of their Chapter 2 allocation; the smallest percentage reserved was 12.6.
- In FY 1989 a total of $90,845,874 was reserved for State use.

Table 4-1 provides the amount and percentage of funds reserved by State.

TABLE 4-1
FUNDS RESERVED FOR STATE USE

STATE	DOLLAR AMOUNT RESERVED	PERCENTAGE RESERVED
ALABAMA	$ 1,434,407	18.0%
ALASKA	459,171	20.0
ARIZONA	772,696	12.6
ARKANSAS	920,983	20.0
CALIFORNIA	9,694,561	20.0
COLORADO	1,173,042	20.0
CONNECTICUT	1,052,829	20.0
DELAWARE	459,171	20.0
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	459,171	20.0
FLORIDA	3,668,422	20.0
GEORGIA	2,441,091	20.0
HAWAII	459,171	20.0

IDAHO	$ 459,171	20.0%
ILLINOIS	4,215,195	20.0
INDIANA	2,094,025	20.0
IOWA	1,039,257	20.0
KANSAS	888,022	20.0
KENTUCKY	1,430,917	20.0
LOUISIANA	1,803,188	20.0
MAINE	459,171	20.0
MARYLAND	1,535,619	20.0
MASSACHUSETTS	1,836,150	20.0
MICHIGAN	3,480,348	20.0
MINNESOTA	1,527,863	20.0
MISSISSIPPI	$ 1,124,569	20.0
MISSOURI	$ 1,998,274	21.9
MONTANA	$ 459,171	20.0
NEBRASKA	585,552	20.0
NEVADA	459,171	20.0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	459,171	20.0
NEW JERSEY	2,555,486	20.0
NEW MEXICO	604,941	20.0
NEW YORK	6,035,834	20.0
NORTH CAROLINA	2,305,367	20.0
NORTH DAKOTA	459,171	20.0
OHIO	3,999,976	20.0
OKLAHOMA	1,312,209	20.0
OREGON	961,700	20.0
PENNSYLVANIA	34,683,365	17.3
RHODE ISLAND	459,171	20.0
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,315,639	19.8
SOUTH DAKOTA	459,171	20.0

TENNESSEE	$ 1,789,616	20.0%
TEXAS	6,751,293	20.0
UTAH	862,816	20.0
VERMONT	459,171	20.0
VIRGINIA	2,012,591	20.0
WASHINGTON	1,603,480	20.0
WEST VIRGINIA	723,214	20.0
WISCONSIN	1,770,227	20.0
WYOMING	459,171	20.0
PUERTO RICO	1,708,716	20.0

Program Administration

By statute States are permitted to use up to 25 percent of the funds reserved by the State (a maximum of 5 percent of the total State allocation) to administer the Chapter 2 program. State applications identify the following types of administrative activities:

- prepare State application
- review LEA applications
- monitor LEAs to ensure program compliance
- provide LEAs with technical assistance regarding program administration and program activities by conducting workshops, disseminating written policies, and consulting
- maintain oversight of the SEA's Chapter 2 program activities

- support financial management functions, including accounting and auditing services
- conduct data collection and reporting activities
- conduct program evaluation
- support the functions of the State Advisory Committee

Fiscal data regarding Chapter 2 funds budgeted for program administration are included in the State applications.

- In FY 1989 $15,275,909 (16.8 percent of the total reserved for State use) was budgeted for program administration.
- Twenty-five States reserved the maximum 25 percent for administration; twenty-seven reserved smaller percentages.
- For States receiving the minimum Chapter 2 allocation of $2,295,857, the maximum amount of administrative funds was $114,792.
- California reserved the smallest percentage (3.5) which equalled $339,000.
- The amount of funds States budgeted for administration ranged from $1,666,767 (TX) to $43,141 (UT) with a mean of $293,767.

Table 4-2 provides the amount and percentage of State set-aside funds budgeted for administration by State.

TABLE 4-2
FUNDS RESERVED FOR ADMINISTRATION

STATE	DOLLAR AMOUNT RESERVED	PERCENTAGE RESERVED
ALABAMA	$ 281,144	19.6%
ALASKA	114,793	25.0
ARIZONA	193,174	25.0
ARKANSAS	230,246	25.0
CALIFORNIA	339,000	3.5
COLORADO	315,807	25.0
CONNECTICUT	261,585	25.0
DELAWARE	110,429	24.0
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	114,793	25.0
FLORIDA	267,707	7.3
GEORGIA	583,782	23.9
HAWAII	106,595	23.2
IDAHO	70,000	15.2
ILLINOIS	1,053,798	25.0
INDIANA	523,507	25.0
IOWA	160,000	15.4
KANSAS	222,000	25.0
KENTUCKY	357,729	25.0
LOUISIANA	450,000	25.0
MAINE	114,793	25.0
MARYLAND	210,331	13.7
MASSACHUSETTS	243,900	13.3
MICHIGAN	865,299	24.7
MINNESOTA	197,000	12.9
MISSISSIPPI	281,142	25.0
MISSOURI	236,755	12.0

MONTANA	$ 113,075	24.6%
NEBRASKA	114,604	19.6
NEVADA	114,791	25.0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	114,792	25.0
NEW JERSEY	332,213	13.0
NEW MEXICO	90,000	14.9
NEW YORK	372,000	6.0
NORTH CAROLINA	576,342	25.0
NORTH DAKOTA	114,792	25.0
OHIO	368,362	9.2
OKLAHOMA	225,940	18.4
OREGON	49,253	5.1
PENNSYLVANIA	415,000	12.0
RHODE ISLAND	113,171	24.6
SOUTH CAROLINA	264,927	20.0
SOUTH DAKOTA	91,301	19.9
TENNESSEE	420,000	23.5
TEXAS	1,666,767	25.0
UTAH	43,141	5.0
VERMONT	114,793	25.0
VIRGINIA	432,200	22.0
WASHINGTON	295,041	18.4
WEST VIRGINIA	180,803	25.0
WISCONSIN	205,300	11.6
WYOMING	144,793	25.0
PUERTO RICO	427,179	25.0

Program Activities

States use their non-administrative Chapter 2 funds for statewide activities and technical assistance to LEAs to

foster the six targeted assistance areas of the Chapter 2 program. While the complete statutory language can be found in Chapter 1 of this report, a short list for reference is provided below:

- Programs for at-risk students
- Programs to acquire and use educational materials to improve instruction
- Schoolwide improvement programs, including effective schools programs
- Programs for professional development
- Programs to enhance student achievement and personal excellence, including health, physical education, and the creative arts
- Programs to enhance the educational program including technology education, gifted & talented education, early childhood education, and community education

States have discretion in the use of Chapter 2 funds among the targeted assistance areas with one exception. States are required to use at least 20 percent of their set-aside for effective schools programs, a mandated activity within the schoolwide improvement assistance area. Activities meeting this requirement include: dissemination of materials related to effective schools programs, conduct of training for school personnel on the implementation of effective schools programs, provision of technical assistance related to implementation, support for effective schools programs for demonstration purposes, and conduct of related evaluations and analyses. This requirement may be waived for States that spend from non-Federal sources twice the amount of the required minimum. In FY 1989 eight States were granted waivers.

State applications included both budgetary and descriptive information regarding planned program activities.

- In FY 1989 a total of $75,569,965 was budgeted to support targeted assistance areas. Across all States, the median amount was $1,005,269.
- The total amount of State Chapter 2 funding for targeted assistance programs ranged from $9,355,561 (CA) to $344,378 (AK, DC, ME, NV, NH, ND, VT, WY).

Table 4-3 provides the amount budgeted for targeted assistance programs by State.

TABLE 4-3
FUNDS RESERVED FOR TARGETED ASSISTANCE

STATE	DOLLAR AMOUNT RESERVED
ALABAMA	$1,153,263
ALASKA	344,378
ARIZONA	569,522
ARKANSAS	690,737
CALIFORNIA	9,355,561
COLORADO	857,235
CONNECTICUT	791,244
DELAWARE	348,742
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	344,378
FLORIDA	3,400,715
GEORGIA	1,857,309
HAWAII	352,576
IDAHO	389,171
ILLINOIS	3,161,397

INDIANA	$1,570,518
IOWA	879,257
KANSAS	666,022
KENTUCKY	1,073,188
LOUISIANA	1,353,188
MAINE	344,378
MARYLAND	1,325,288
MASSACHUSETTS	1,592,250
MICHIGAN	2,615,049
MINNESOTA	1,330,863
MISSISSIPPI	843,427
MISSOURI	1,761,499
MONTANA	346,096
NEBRASKA	470,948
NEVADA	344,380
NEW HAMPSHIRE	344,379
NEW JERSEY	2,223,273
NEW MEXICO	514,941
NEW YORK	5,663,834
NORTH CAROLINA	1,729,025
NORTH DAKOTA	344,379
OHIO	3,631,614
OKLAHOMA	1,005,269
OREGON	912,447
PENNSYLVANIA	3,053,365
RHODE ISLAND	346,000
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,050,712
SOUTH DAKOTA	367,870
TENNESSEE	1,369,616
TEXAS	5,084,526

UTAH	$ 819,675
VERMONT	344,378
VIRGINIA	1,580,391
WASHINGTON	1,308,439
WEST VIRGINIA	542,411
WISCONSIN	1,564,927
WYOMING	344,378
PUERTO RICO	1,281,537

While most States carry out the targeted assistance programs from the State level, States are authorized to make direct grants to LEAs for these purposes. In FY 1989 nine States indicated in their applications that some portion of their non-administrative Chapter 2 funds would be used for grants to LEAs. There was insufficient information to determine the amount to be used for this purpose.

States must provide for equitable participation by nonpublic school students and teachers in its instructional and/or staff training activities. A majority of the State applications addressed this provision, generally indicating a percentage or amount of funds budgeted to provide nonpublic school services (usually opportunities to participate in staff training). States that did not budget funds for this purpose did not provide Statewide training for which private school personnel would have been eligible participants.

State applications included budgeted amounts for each of the six targeted assistance areas.

- States budgeted funds across an average of four targeted assistance programs, with a range of one to six programs and modal values of three and six programs (13 States at each modal value).
- 35 of 52 States budgeted a total of $11,789,607 for programs for at-risk students.
- 32 of 52 States budgeted a total of $6,244,353 for programs to acquire and use educational materials to improve instruction.
- 51 of 52 States budgeted a total of $32,161,718 for schoolwide improvement programs, including effective schools programs.
- 40 of 52 States budgeted a total of $11,330,332 for programs for professional development.
- 27 of 52 States budgeted a total of $5,368,058 for programs to enhance student achievement and personal excellence, including health, physical education, and the creative arts.
- 31 of 52 States budgeted a total of $9,441,434 for programs to enhance the educational program including technology education, gifted & talented education, early childhood education, and community education.

The percentage of total funding of each targeted assistance program was:

- At-Risk: 16 percent
- Instructional Materials: 8 percent
- Schoolwide Improvement: 42 percent
- Professional Development: 15 percent
- Personal Excellence: 7 percent
- Enhance Education: 12 percent

Table 4-4 provides the amount budgeted for each targeted assistance program by State.

TABLE 4-4
TARGETED ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

STATE	AT-RISK	INSTRUCT. MATERIALS	SCHOOL IMPROV.	STAFF TRAINING	PERSONAL EXCEL.	OTHER INNOV.	No.
AL			230,653	689,882		232,728	3
AK	27,550	58,544	65,432	158,414	17,219	17,219	6
AZ			409,522		160,000		2
AR	150,000	100,000	234,197	75,000	25,000	106,540	6
CA	783,000		5,436,700	676,000	214,000	832,000	5
CO	381,690		325,917	277,923			3
CT	144,798			193,064	96,532	48,266	4
DE		108,428	123,536	104,772			3
DC			597,551				1
FL	370,158	280,091	2,332,769	235,558	242,937	672,886	6
GA		48,257	703,049				2
HI		111,766	111,500	129,310			3
ID			180,000			209,000	2
IL	421,520		843,039	843,039	521,520	632,279	5
IN	164,681	199,020	418,805	345,865	91,867	100,780	6
IA		54,762	207,851	211,037	237,357	168,250	5
KS			260,000	406,000			2
KY	248,681		286,184	15,351	230,000	292,972	5
LA	700,000		400,000	200,000			3
ME			100,000	69,500	32,000	15,000	4
MD	449,100	254,524	393,000	499,997			4
MA	345,900	296,300	400,000	320,200		231,100	5
MI	129,543	200,000	703,981	404,882	351,038	825,605	6
MN	62,000	103,000	477,000	71,000	250,000		5
MS	77,842	138,063	447,924	70,127		31,629	5
MO	211,082		1,146,006			404,411	3
MT	15,925	62,162	104,893	63,582	25,590	71,524	6
NB		128,930	225,000		101,027		3
NV	27,089		120,992	140,771		124,313	4
NH			90,460	84,000			2
NJ	562,207		1,201,078	587,762		204,439	4
NM	85,400	70,500	145,090	70,500	90,700	52,300	6

NY	1,059,000	473,000	1,820,000	817,000	709,000	397,000	6
NC	225,000	225,000	466,000		563,025	250,000	5
ND	40,843	12,446	121,120	118,356	34,135	17,479	6
OH	692,366	390,976	878,547	828,634	299,453	541,638	6
OK		177,366	763,044		64,859		3
OR	36,302	18,698	549,260	128,280	90,412	89,495	6
PA	350,000	530,000	1,513,365	660,000			4
RI			176,000	85,000		85,000	3
SC	386,561		377,480	286,671			3
SD		20,000	158,000	117,000		66,000	4
TN	90,000		1,279,616				2
TX	2,285,528		2,009,841	879,935			3
UT	120,789	38,827	310,618	120,799	120,799	81,968	6
VT		71,712	112,683		9,580	79,086	4
VA	103,632	51,816	402,587	118,437	96,229		5
WA	150,727	44,897	1,112,815				3
WV		20,000	415,901	79,490			3
WI	291,389	218,541	193,401	145,694	393,375	320,527	6
WY	105,000	50,000	96,834	1,500			4
PR	494,934	1,669,472	683,477		300,404	2,240,000	5
Total	$11,789,607	$6,244,353	$32,161,718	$11,330,332	$5,368,058	$9,441,434	

GRAND TOTAL = $76,335,502

Support for effective schools programs activities was substantial.

- 44 of 52 States budgeted a total of $22,615,903 for effective schools programs. The remaining eight States received waivers from the requirement.
- 26 of the 44 States budgeting funds for effective schools programs exceeded the minimum 20 percent set-aside.
- Nine States (DC, FL, NJ, NY, PA, TN, TX, WA, WV) reserved more than 40 percent of their Chapter 2 funds for effective schools programs.

Table 4-5 provides the amount budgeted to support effective schools programs by State.

TABLE 4-5

FUNDS RESERVED FOR EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS

STATE	AMOUNT RSERVED	PERCENT RESERVED	STATE	AMOUNT RESERVED	PERC ENT RESE RVED
AL	$ 280,977	20%	NB	$ 150,000	26%
AK	WAIVER		NV	120,992	21
AZ	409,522	27	NH	90,460	20
AR	184,196	20	NJ	1,217,921	47
CA	WAIVER		NM	145,090	20
CO	332,500	25	NY	2,295,000	42
CT	WAIVER		NC	466,000	20
DE	145,829	25	ND	90,460	20
FL	1,467,369	40	OH	WAIVER	
GA	467,026	20	OK	241,677	20
HI	127,371	24	OR	549,260	20
ID	180,000	39	PA	1,513,365	43
IL	817,278	20	RI	WAIVER	
IN	418,805	20	SC	377,480	29
IA	207,851	20	SD	158,000	35
KS	260,000	29	TN	1,279,616	71
KY	286,184	20	TX	3,518,469	52
LA	400,000	22	UT	189,819	22
ME	100,000	22	VT	112,683	25
MD	393,000	22	VA	402,587	20
MA	400,000	20	WA	897,949	56
MI	WAIVER		WV	258,314	40

STATE	AMOUNT RSERVED	PERCENT RESERVED	STATE	AMOUNT RESERVED	PERC ENT RESE RVED
MN	WAIVER		WI	WAIVER	
MS	$ 373,791	34%	WY	$ 91,834	20%
MO	420,018	26	DC	345,007	76
MT	90,460	20	PR	341,743	20

GRAND TOTAL = $22,615,903

State applications included descriptions of hundreds of activities States intend to support with Chapter 2 funds within the six targeted assistance programs. A representative selection of those activities, grouped by targeted assistance area, follows.

Programs to meet the educational needs of students at risk of failure in school and of dropping out and students for whom providing an education entails higher than average costs

- Assist LEAs in planning and implementing desegregation programs, and multi-cultural curricula (MA)
- Assist LEAs in remediating students failing the Functional Literacy Exam (a graduation test); assist LEAs in implementing programs for handicapped students and monitor the effectiveness of those programs (MS)
- Provide LEAs with seminars regarding characteristics of at-risk students; develop alternative teaching strategies; provide workshops summarizing research; disseminate materials; and provide on-site support (NM)
- Train building level support teams to assist teachers resolve learning and behavior problems (ND)
- Initiate a student accountability tracking system which can be used to report students identified as dropouts to use as data in dropout prevention programs (OR)
- Sponsor an Open Libraries program whose objective is to relate reading to school instruction through the acquisition of instructional materials and recreational reading materials of interest to at-risk students (PA)

- Support competitive dropout prevention grants to districts whose dropout rates are in the top 25% of all districts in the state (WA)

Programs for the acquisition and use of instructional and educational materials, including library books, reference materials, computer software and hardware for instructional use and other curricular materials that would be used to improve the quality of instruction

- Support the State Film Library and the Library Resource Center (DE)

- Support the School Library Network to assist school libraries in the use of computer technology, the use of libraries in instruction, and the exchange of resources between libraries (HI)

- Support workshops to help teachers make better use of instructional video resources and select reading materials to increase the level of recreational reading (IN)

Innovative programs designed to carry out schoolwide improvements, including the effective schools program

SCHOOLWIDE IMPROVEMENTS

- Sponsor forums throughout the state where educators, legislators, and lay persons can discuss concepts and principles concerning school restructuring. Forums will provide the ground work for a program to create model projects in school systems (NB)

- Support the Sharing Success program created to bring school and educators with identified needs together with already developed programs meeting those needs (NY)

- Support a Comprehensive Reading Plan initiative to establish a curriculum framework for language literacy and learning across all curricular areas (PA)

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS

- Establish a clearinghouse to assemble and catalog research materials, resource persons, program descriptions, and effective school sites which may be visited; conduct workshops on effective schools research (AL)

- Improve parent and community involvement and participation;disseminate educational materials related to effective schools programs (AZ)

- Assist LEAs/schools to perform Program Quality Review (self-study) as part of a comprehensive planning process focused on improving achievement and academic instruction for all students (CA)

- Support demonstration schools(having high concentrations of low-income students) to implement an effective schools process, in conjunction with consultant Larry Lezotte (AR)

- Continue support for an effective schools program that dates back to 1980--SEA has provided assistance to 108 schools (35 LEAs) serving 35,000 students to conduct comprehensive school assessments (policies/procedures, student achievement, faculty perceptions), school team planning institutes, and to build support networks between schools (CT)

- Support the BEST initiative, a professional development forum for school personnel to meet, share strategies, and receive information of a Coordinating Council for School Improvement to regularly channel innovative techniques being used locally and nationally regarding effective programs; provide mini-grants to schools wanting to improve effectiveness (DC)

- Provide funds to schools to implement effective schools programs (State funds to be matched one-for-one by local dollars--could include LEA Chapter 2 funds) (FL)

- Support a Business-Education partnership to foster community involvement in planning & managing school programs; foster safe schools through school security attendants and alarm systems; measure progress through a comprehensive assessment package using commercial standardized tests, criterion-referenced tests, and minimum competency graduation tests; and support for recruitment and training programs for school administrators (HI)

- Revise state curriculum guides to integrate effective schools research (ID)

- Train faculty teams from each of 14 identified schools to conduct a school needs assessment, analyze results, and plan a school improvement process (NV)

- Identify model programs (especially ones serving disadvantaged students) and programs emphasizing higher order thinking; identify assessment systems requiring the use of higher order skills (IA)

- Support demonstration programs for Maine Aspirations/High Expectation in Learning & Performance which emphasize the acquisition of basic and higher order skills and creation of a school climate of expectation that virtually all children can learn under appropriate conditions (ME)

- Provide competitive grants for the Carnegie school program to support schools with a strong commitment to shared decision-making and schools that can secure and demonstrate support from the district level and the community; conduct the Opportunity Schools Program of technical assistance to schools (K-12) ranked in the lower 1/4 of the schools statewide on all 3 areas of the basic skills tests administered (MA)

- Sponsor the Lighthouse Schools Program, a training program to improve school quality by implementing the effective schools process. The program involves LEAs committing themselves for a 3 year implementation process. Activity includes the design of a program to reward "Lighthouse Schools" which achieve high student performance (OK)

- Support for the Coalition of Essential Schools, a reform initiative devoted to strengthening the learning of students by reforming schools' priorities and simplifying their structure (RI)

- Develop, field test, and implement a system for the evaluation of teachers based on the research base of effective teaching that will also be used to identify staff development needs (SC)

- Support efforts to define the minimum academic mastery objectives for each grade level and curricular area (VA)

- Comprehensive set of activities to develop effective schools programs including inservice related to improving student achievement, support of school/community councils to improve school climate, and the provision of activities to promote the learning of advanced skills including: science labs, foreign language instruction, and computer labs (WI)

Programs of training and professional development to enhance the knowledge and skills of educational personnel including teachers, librarians, school counselors and other pupil services personnel, and administrators and school board members

- Sponsor the Marine Sciences and Space Orientation--math, social studies, science, gifted & talented education--for teachers and supervisors (AL)

- Support a Statewide Teacher Center (DE)

- Support a training component to teach cooperative learning techniques to teachers (SC)

Programs designed to enhance personal excellence of students and student achievement, including instruction in ethics, performing and creative arts, humanities, activities in physical fitness and comprehensive health education, and participation in community service projects

- Develop assessment program based on State-identified essential skills to measure statewide progress toward educational goals including: achievement levels at the end of grades 3, 8, and 12; graduation rates; post-school employment and college enrollment rates. (AZ)

- Support recognition programs for individual students in elementary and secondary schools, recognizing academic excellence, coordinated through the Center for School Improvement and Performance; develop a values education curriculum and support ten schools as model sites (IN)

Innovative projects which would enhance the educational program and climate of the school, including programs for gifted and talented students, technology education programs, early childhood education programs, community education and programs for youth suicide prevention

- Support technical assistance for personnel charged with examining LEA operations and making recommendations for improvement (AL)

- Develop curriculum and assessment programs for math, science, English, foreign language, history, visual/performing arts, health & nutrition, p.e.; support for special activities including: Constitutional Rights Found. for Mock Trial and History Day Programs, Handbook and Moral and Civic Education, Teacher Centers; support

for task forces examining elementary grades and high school (CA)

- Support leadership efforts to promote State's community education initiative; support technical assistance to LEAs regarding youth suicide prevention efforts (IN)
- Support a State priorities for international education and for school choice (MN)
- Support two pilot early education programs for families with children ages 3-5 (NC)
- Provide in-service training regarding teaching gifted students and programs for gifted students (SD)

CHAPTER 5
FORCE FOR EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT

Chapter 2 is the major source of federal funds made available to State educational agencies to support educational improvement. State Chapter 2 applications provide ample evidence of the energy and leadership States are bringing to the mission of reforming American education for the next century.

The following examples illustrate the exemplary use of Chapter 2 to provide State leadership for educational quality:

COMMUNICATION WITH THE EDUCATION AND LAY COMMUNITIES

- Conduct surveys of the opinions of Michigan citizens about educational issues (MI)
- Assess LEA needs for input into decisions regarding SEA's Chapter 2 program (IA)
- Establish a computerized reporting system regarding the implementation of effective schools programs (ND)

SUPPORT FOR EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION

- Support cutting edge LEA projects including a critical thinking skills project and a science project using a portable planetarium and videodisc technology (MN)
- Sponsor scholarships for the Principal Leadership Academy which give participants one year sabbaticals to design school improvement programs and then return to school to implement them (OK)

FOCUS ON EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND EXCELLENCE

- Support the Wyoming Super School Program to recognize outstanding schools and development of an outcomes-based school accreditation process (WY)

- Integrate Chapter 2 into the statewide effective schools focus (Five year Plan for Educational Improvement) that includes school accreditation, teacher certification, and statewide testing (MS)